

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-16, 18, 22-24, 26, and 43 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 15 being the independent claims. New claim 43 is sought to be added. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 15, and 24 are sought to be amended. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 15 can be found, for example, at page 12, lines 15-17 and page 13, lines 21-23 of the as filed specification. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Statement of Substance of Interview

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, Applicants provide the following statement of Substance of the Interview. Applicants express their appreciation to Examiner Popham for the courtesy of an interview with Applicants' representative on June 10, 2009. During the interview, differences between the references of record and the claimed invention were discussed. In addition, proposed amendments to the independent claims were discussed to further distinguish the claims over the references of record.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-12, and 14

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-12, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,830 to Nakaya et al. (“Nakaya”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,890 to Yamaura (“Yamaura”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,145,017 to Ghaffari (“Ghaffari”).

The Examiner, in support of the rejection of claim 1, cites to a description in Nakaya of a sequence of instructions U2-U6 that are executed in parallel by a plurality of processors P2-P6. (final Office Action, page 5, citing to 12:10-62, 25:40-26:12, and FIG. 7.) Specifically, the Examiner appears to contend that Nakaya discloses delaying the generation of an interrupt until all of the parallel processors P2-P6 have completed processing and each instruction U2-U6 has been executed. (*Id.*) However, the fact that Nakaya may delay the generation of an interrupt until ***all*** parallel processors P2-P6 are finished processing is irrelevant.

Claim 1 recites two, mutual exclusive conditional statements:

- (1) if the first data completes before processing of the second data completes and the first control record is ***younger*** than the second control record; and
- (2) if the first data completes before processing of the second data completes and the first control record is ***older*** than the second control record.

If the first conditional statement holds true, an interrupt is delayed from being issued through a two-step moving process. That is, an interrupt is delayed by “moving the first interrupt indicator associated with the first control record onto a second interrupt indicator associated with the second control record” as recited in claim 1.

However, if the second conditional statement holds true, an interrupt is not delayed from being issued. Rather, as recited in claim 1 “if the first data completes before processing of the second data completes and the first control record is *older* than the second control record, generating an interrupt when processing of the first data completes, the interrupt being generated before processing of the second data completes.” (Emphasis added.)

Nakaya does not teach or suggest delaying the generation of interrupt when the above noted first conditional statement holds true and generating an interrupt, without delay, when the above noted second conditional statement holds true. Rather, Nakaya at most teaches delaying an interrupt until *all* parallel processors P2-P6 are finished processing. Therefore, not only does Nakaya fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1, but in fact teaches away. Specifically, if the second conditional statement of claim 1 holds true, an “interrupt [is] generated *before* processing of the second data completes;” that is, before all processing engines have completed their respective processing tasks. Nakaya expressly teaches away from this feature.

Yamaura and Ghaffari do not cure the deficiencies of Nakaya. For the reasons set forth above, the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari cannot render claim 1 unpatentable. Claims 3, 4, 8-12, and 14 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 15-18, 20-24, and 26

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 15,-18, 20-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakaya in view of Yamaura (“Yamaura”) Ghaffari, and in view of Pierson et al., “Context-Agile Encryption for High Speed Communication Networks” (“Pierson”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Pierson does not in anyway remedy the deficiencies of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari with respect to independent claim 1, as discusses above. Consequently, the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson cannot render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Claim 2 is similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which it depends, and further in view of its own respective feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 recites, among other features “wherein an interrupt is configured to be generated if processing of the first control record completes before processing of the second control record completes and the first control record is older than the second control record, the interrupt being generated before processing of the second control record completes.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari do not teach or suggest such a feature. Pierson does not cure the deficiencies of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari. Consequently, the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson cannot render independent claim 15 unpatentable. Claims 16, 18, 22-24, and 26 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson for the same reasons as

independent claim 15, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15-18, 22-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Glenn J. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,458

Date: 17 June 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

990589_1.DOC